

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AUSTIN DIVISION

Filed 10/19/21
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

BY: BJ
DEPUTY

v.

CYRIL LARTIGUE,

CRIMINAL NO. 1:20-CR-156-RP

Defendant.

DEFENDANT'S AGREEMENTS & OBJECTIONS TO GOVERNMENT'S EXHIBITS:
(SPONSORING WITNESS: REY ALATORRE)

EXH.	DESCRIPTION	AGREEMENT/OBJECTION
20	Facebook post	No Objection
21	Cyril Lartigue's Twitter Account Information	No Objection
22	Communists E girl's account information	Objections: Hearsay; Relevance. This is not Mr. Lartigue nor his account.
23	Conversation over twitter between Lartigue and Communist E girl	Objection No. 1: Hearsay While Mr. Lartigue's statements are not hearsay under FRE 801(d)(2)(A), the other person's statements are hearsay. There are specific dangers of hearsay present in several statements: -("Yeah I wouldn't recommend doing that. I refrained from saying I plan to throw stuff at cops tomorrow in Tampa so they can't ever say I planned it or get me for gang violence or some dumb bs charges.") and -("I would save the Molotovs for now") that could be subject to improper argument. If denied, those statements should be redacted.

		<p>Objection No. 2: 401 and 403</p> <p>The government intends to introduce pictures of 2x4s in Mr. Lartigue's trunk. These were not brought to the protest nor seized. The probative effect is low as it does not make any element of the indictment more probable than not, and it creates a risk of unfair prejudice.</p>
24	Conversation over twitter between Lartigue and Communist E girl	<p>Objection: Hearsay</p> <p>While Mr. Lartigue's statements are not hearsay under FRE 801(d)(2)(A), the other person's statements are hearsay. There are specific dangers of hearsay present in several statements:</p> <p>-("Yeah I wouldn't recommend doing that. I refrained from saying I plan to throw stuff at cops tomorrow in Tampa so they can't ever say I planned it or get me for gang violence or some dumb bs charges.") -("I would save the Molotovs for now")</p> <p>that could be subject to improper argument. If denied, those statements should be redacted.</p>
25	Lartigue's twitter	No objection
26	Summary of twitter conversation	<p>Objection: Hearsay; 403</p> <p>(Same objections as in Exhibits 23-24)</p>
27	Twitter account certificate	No objection
28	Twitter account certificate	<p>Objection: Relevance</p> <p>Same objection as Exhibit 22 – this is not Mr. Lartigue's account</p>
29	Cell phone video	<p>Objection: 4th Amendment; United States v. Jones, 239 F.3d 233, 236 (5th Cir. 2006)</p> <p>In furtherance of Defendant's Motion to Suppress (Dkt. 43) which the Court denied (Dkt. 58), Mr. Lartigue renews his motion to suppress evidence and objects to the introduction of all evidence seized from the warrantless search.</p>

30	Cell phone video	Objection: 4th Amendment; United States v. Jones, 239 F.3d 233, 236 (5th Cir. 2006)
31	Cell phone photo	Objection: 4th Amendment; United States v. Jones, 239 F.3d 233, 236 (5th Cir. 2006)
32	Cell phone photo - trunk (2x4s)	Objection No. 1: 4th Amendment; United States v. Jones, 239 F.3d 233, 236 (5th Cir. 2006) Objection No. 2: 401 & 403 (See discussion above regarding photographs of clubs in objection to Exhibit 23)
33	Cell phone photo	Objection: 4th Amendment; United States v. Jones, 239 F.3d 233, 236 (5th Cir. 2006)
34	Text message conversation (with photos)	Objection No. 1: 4th Amendment; United States v. Jones, 239 F.3d 233, 236 (5th Cir. 2006) Objection No. 2: 401 & 403 (See discussion above regarding photographs of clubs in objection to Exhibit 23)
35	Cell phone search history	Objection: 4th Amendment; United States v. Jones, 239 F.3d 233, 236 (5th Cir. 2006)
36	Text message conversation (with photos)	Objection No. 1: 4th Amendment; United States v. Jones, 239 F.3d 233, 236 (5th Cir. 2006) Objection No. 2: 401 & 403 (See discussion above regarding photographs of clubs in objection to Exhibit 23)
39	Facebook certificate	No objection
40	Instagram post	No objection
41	NFA Certificate	Objection No. 1: Hearsay This is the out of court statement of Jason S. Bowers. Objection No. 2: Confrontation Clause; Melendez-Diaz v. Massachusetts, 557 US 305 (2009)

59 - 63	Printouts of webpages on Molotov cocktails	<p>Objection No. 1: 403 The Court's charge will instruct the jury on the law; this series of exhibits is precisely why Rule 403 exists: these exhibits will confuse the issues, mislead the jury, and potentially shift the jury's inquiry from the Court's instructions as the authority for the law to instead used the Internet (and Wikipedia).</p> <p>The probative value – that Mr. Lartigue conducted searches – can be achieved through Exh. 35. Exhibits 59-63 fail Rule 403's balancing test as a result.</p> <p>Objection No. 2: 4th Amendment; United States v. Jones, 239 F.3d 233, 236 (5th Cir. 2006) This exhibit and the others that follow are fruits from the search of Mr. Lartigue's backpack and phone.</p> <p>Objection No. 3: Hearsay under FRE 802</p> <p>Objection No. 4: Authenticity</p>
------------	--	--

Respectfully submitted,

SUMPTER & GONZALEZ L.L.P.
3011 N. Lamar Blvd, Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78705
Telephone: (512) 381-9955
Facsimile: (512) 485-3121

By: /s/ David M. Gonzalez
David M. Gonzalez
State Bar No. 24012711

Worth D. Carroll
State Bar No. 24091192

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

By my signature below, I do hereby certify that October 19, 2021, a true and correct copy of the foregoing Defendant's Objections was hand delivered to:

Keith M. Henneke
ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Gabriel Cohen
ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

United States Attorney's Office
Western District of Texas
903 San Jacinto Blvd., Ste. 334
Austin, Texas 78701

/s/ David M. Gonzalez
David Gonzalez